| Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary | Application No. | Applicant(s) |
|--|-----------------|----------------|
| | 10/632,281 | ELLIOTT ET AL. |
| | Examiner | Art Unit |
| | Ardin Marschel | 1614 |
| All Participants: Status of Application: | | |
| (1) Ardin Marschel(SPE). | (3) | |
| (2) Christian Smolizza (Appl. Rep.). | (4) | |
| Date of Interview: 25 August 2006 | Time: | |
| Type of Interview: ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative) Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Yes, provide a brief description: | | |
| Part I. | | |
| Rejection(s) discussed: N/A | | |
| Claims discussed: N/A | | |
| Prior art documents discussed: N/A | | |
| Part II. | | |
| SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED: Mr. Smolizza verified that no response to the rejection(s) in the office action, mailed 2/13/06, has been submitted. A request for time extension only was filed for copendency with a continuation application. | | |
| Part III. | | |
| It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview | | |
| did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above. | | |
| | | |
| Adi Maralet | | |
| (Examiner/SPE Signature) (Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate) | | |